



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/839,714 | 04/19/2001 | Bo-In Lin | L&C2k01(09 / 839,714) | 2769 |
| 7590 | 12/22/2003 | | EXAMINER | CHOW, MING |
| Bo-In Lin 13445 Mandoli Drive Los Altos Hills, CA 94022 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2645 | 6 |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 12/22/2003 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/839,714 | LIN, BO-IN |
| | Examiner Ming Chow | Art Unit 2645 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 1, 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The phrase “a user’s presence at a location associated with one of said forwarding destination numbers” is not disclosed by the specification. The specification, on lines 17-31, disclosed a user presence identification device. Upon detecting the user’s presence, the call forwarding information is updated in the database. However, the specification did not disclose that the new presence is associated with one of said forwarding destination numbers (pre-existing forwarding numbers). The new presence may be a new number which has never been used as a forwarding number.

2. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The phrase “forwarding sequence of each of said callers” is not disclosed by the specification. The “forwarding sequence” disclosed by the specification refers to multiple destination numbers where the call is forwarded to in sequence. However, the claimed limitation “forwarding sequence of each of said callers” refers to multiple callers whose calls are forwarded in sequence to the one destination number.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2-6, 10-14, 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al (US: 5946386), and in view of Grimes et al (US: 5428663).

For claims 2, 17, 19, 20, 22, regarding “a message routing means....of destinations”, Rogers et al teach on column 13 line 13-39 call routing.

Regarding “a database.....destination number”, Rogers et al teach on column 3 line 16-20. The “one number “ of Rogers et al is the claimed “unified access number” (one number to send voice, fax and data calls). Rogers et al also teach on column 9 line 1-11 call management database includes caller identification information. As Rogers et al teach on column 3 line 16-20 the “one number” is used to identify the caller. Therefore, the “one number” must be included in the call management database. Rogers et al teach on column 2 line 21-35 VIP rules for transferring calls (reads on the claimed “forwarding destination number”). Since the call management database includes the VIP rules (of transferring calls), the forwarding destination numbers must be included in the call management database.

Regarding “said database further.....list of callers”, Rogers et al teach on column 25 line 56-60 the called party uses call control window (claimed “user interface”) to edit the primary caller ID database (of the call management databases).

Rogers et al teach on item 716 Fig. 7abc “updating said database for modifying first forwarding destination number”.

Rogers et al failed to teach “a user presence detecting means for automatically detecting a user’s presence”. However, Grimes et al teach on column 2 line 37-68 a user presence detecting means detecting the location for call forwarding.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al to have the “a user presence detecting means for automatically detecting a user’s presence” as taught by Grimes et al such that the modified system of Rogers et al would be able to support the user presence detecting means to the system users.

Regarding claim 3, Rogers et al teach on Fig. 2 call management computer (claimed “unified access management center”).

Rogers et al failed to teach “automatically updating....destination number”. However, relative to the teaching reference by Grimes et al, the rejections as stated in claim 2 above apply.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Rogers et al teach on column 37 line 47-51 the user may change his “one number”. Rogers et al also teach on column 44 line 19-21 the system user may call his own “one number” and enter a password for access authorization. This system of Rogers et al must register the system user in order to verify the entered password. The entering a password reads on the claimed “logging”.

Regarding claim 6, Rogers et al teach on column 3 line 15-20 the “one number” is single unique telephone number to each user. Since the VIP rule of forwarding a call is based on the identity of the calling party (the “one number”), there must be a second forwarding destination number associated with a second caller.

Regarding claim 10, Rogers et al teach on column 38 line 47-48 rules of forwarding sequence of a FAX.

Regarding claim 11, Rogers et al teach on column 38 line 44-46 rules of time-dependent forwarding sequence.

Regarding claim 12, the sequential forwarding processes (as rejections stated in claims 10 and 11 above) taught by Rogers et al are based on rules stored in the call management database. The sequential forwarding taught by Rogers et al must be enabled by the database.

Regarding claim 13, Rogers et al teach on column 22 line 16-26 real-time control of calls, call transfers and call forwarding. The “real-time control” of Rogers et al reads on the claimed “simultaneous”.

Regarding claim 14, Rogers et al teach on column 22 line 18 e-mail is also one of message types supported by the Roger’s system.

Regarding claims 16, 18, 21, Rogers et al teach on column 3 line 44-48 applying priority to each call (reads on claimed “forwarding sequence of each of said callers”).

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al, and in view of Grimes et al, Junkin (US: 6493717), Lombardo (US: 6341290), Yamaguchi (US: 6499055), Grimes et al (US: 5428663).

Regarding “a message....of destinations” and “a unified access....destination numbers”, the rejections as stated in claim 2 above apply.

Regarding “a unified access....destination numbers”, the rejections as stated in claim 2 above apply.

Rogers et al failed to teach “Unified access management center....lists of callers”. However, Junkin teaches on column 2 line 65 to column 3 line 17 editing a database via an HTML-based internet browser.

Rogers et al failed to teach “unified access management....number to said database”. However, the rejections as stated in claim 8 apply.

Rogers et al failed to teach “user access control....editing said database”. However, the rejections as stated in claim 9 apply.

Rogers et al failed to teach “unified access management....(e-mail) message”. However, the rejections as stated in claim 7 apply.

Rogers et al failed to teach “a user presence detecting means....destination numbers”. The rejections as stated in claim 2 above apply.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al to have the “a user presence detecting means....destination numbers”, “Unified access management center....lists of callers”, “unified access management....number to said database”, “user access control....editing said database” and “unified access management....(e-

mail) message” as taught by Rogers et al, Junkin, Lombardo and Yamaguchi such that the modified system of Rogers et al would be able to support the user presence detecting means, internet-web user interface for editing database, user-access control means, user-logging in means, and telephone message processor to the system users.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al as applied to claimed 2 above, and in view of Grimes, Yamaguchi (US: 6499055). Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al failed to teach “unified access.....(e-mail) message”. However, Yamaguchi teaches on column 4 line 4-12 a WWW server for receiving and processing e-mails. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al, Grimes et al to have the “unified access.....(e-mail) message” as taught by Yamaguchi such that the modified system of Rogers et al, Grimes et al would be able to support the web site to the system users.

6. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al as applied to claimed 3 above, and in view of Grimes et al, Lombardo et al (US: 6341290). Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al failed to teach “unified access.....to said database” and “unified access.....editing said database”. However, Lombardo et al teach on column 8 line 32-40 access control by using a web page for login. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al, Grimes et al to have the “unified access.....to said database” and “unified access.....editing said database” as taught by Lombardo

et al such that the modified system of Rogers et al, Grimes et al would be able to support the web site to the system users.

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al as applied to claimed 2 above, and in view of Grimes et al, Porter (US: 6282270). Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al failed to teach “database further comprising.....destination URL”. However, Porter teaches on Abstract that voice messages are forwarded from the WWW server to its client. The URL of the www client must be stored on the system. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al, Grimes et al to have the “database further comprising.....destination URL” as taught by Porter such that the modified system of Rogers et al, grimes et al would be able to support the URL to the system users.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed on 9/10/03 have been fully considered.

i) Applicant argues, on page 10-15, regarding amendments. New grounds rejections necessitated by the amendments have been stated above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this application and office action should be directed to the examiner Ming Chow whose telephone number is (703) 305-4817. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (703) 305-4895. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

Art Unit: 2645

proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to TC2600's Customer Service FAX Number 703-872-9314.

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2645

Ming Chow

(M)

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

